

Date: Sat, 2 Apr 94 04:30:10 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #159
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 2 Apr 94 Volume 94 : Issue 159

Today's Topics:

 40 meter Broadcast QRM
 Amateur Radio current callsigns
 Incentive Licensing (3 msgs)
 lowest frequency FCC cares about? (4 msgs)
 Ramsey Kits

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 1 Apr 1994 14:28:18 GMT
From: emba-news.uvm.edu!griffin.emba.uvm.edu!gdavis@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 40 meter Broadcast QRM
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

After hearing Radio Germany make what must have been a deliberate
broadcast to North America, last night, I'm curious who has priority
on the 40 meter band. It was my understanding that all broadcasters
were not allowed to beam to region two (N.A.).

It's pretty tough when their estimated power from the xmtr is at least
100kw and their antennas 12 to 15 db!

I've noted that Russia violates the region 2 rule with special English
language programs on several 40 meter frequencies, which they specifically
say is directed to North America.

Why does there need be so many parallel transmitters? At least three

frequencies from Russia have the same program simultaneously.
Signal levels would imply the RF is being directed to region 2.

It's amazing that after years of IARU work we still must, more or less,
live with the megawatt AM broadcasters.

--

***** Gary E. Davis***** WQ1F *****

The most common of all follies is to believe passionately in the
palpably not true. It is the chief occupation of mankind.-H.L.Mencken

Date: Thu, 31 Mar 94 23:42:01 GMT
From: butch!enterprise!news@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Amateur Radio current callsigns
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <765073738snz@g8s.jp.demon.co.uk>, ip@g8s.jp.demon.co.uk (Iain Philipps)
writes:

|> In article <1994Mar30.145242.63078@austin.onu.edu>

|> droberts@austin.onu.edu "Dan Roberts" writes:

|>

|> > Lo.. If I were to take my General class test today, approximately what would

|> > my callsign turn out to be? Does anyone know where to find this sort of

|> > info? I thought I saw it in QST once, but haven't been able to find it

|> > in the recent copy.

|> >

|> > Anyone help? N8XXW

|>

|>

|> Someone care to help *me* ?

|>

|> I thought that WAS a General call! Oh well ...

|>

|> --

|> Iain Philipps

The same call pool is used for Tech and General, so N8XXW will keep his call
if he passes the General. Go for Advanced!!

George N7TNJ/6

Date: 31 Mar 1994 18:22:49 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!
newsrelay.iastate.edu!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!zip.eecs.umich.edu!yeshua.marcam.com!
charnel!olivea!news.bbn.com!news!levin@@.
Subject: Incentive Licensing
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <p0zMh7A.edellers@delphi.com> Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:
Michael P. Deignan <md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu> writes:

>This really doesn't differ all that much from what we have today, except
>certain elements in amateur radio would like to remove the "work" aspect
>towards gaining additional spectrum, and instead have you place an 'X' on
>a form from the FCC and get all spectrum with no work.

Would you mind substantiating that claim with some names? I haven't seen
anyone here asking for such a CB-type licensing process.

He's just singing his same old song again.

/JBL

Date: Thu, 31 Mar 1994 17:47:22 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!news.moneng.mei.com!uwm.edu!
mixcom.com!kevin.jessup@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Incentive Licensing
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In <x80s5f0.ndfriedman@delphi.com> Neil D. Friedman <ndfriedman@delphi.com>
writes:

>
>In a broader sense, incentive licensing simply refers to the principle
>of granting more privileges as an incentive to pass more rigorous
>examinations. In this sense, incentive licensing was around for
>several decades before 1952 (the old class A - B - C system) and
>has been with us since 1967.

The current system assumes that all hams find HF more attractive than
2 meters and above. All the "REAL" advancements are occurring well
above 30 MHz. Those of us interested and capable of experimenting
on the UHF and higher bands find the current theory portions of the tests
(from novice on up to extra) rather trivial.

I know not everyone is an EE. Still, should the incentive system not
reflect a little more of the current state-of-the-art in radio
communications systems??

The theory tests are basically a joke. I hear far more people agonizing over the difficulty of the code than the theory. I'm not saying that code should be eliminated or made easier, just pointing out my experience regarding theory.

Basically, the incentive system exists today to keep the "CB'ers" off of HF. How well that works is another topic. IMO, RF theory and real world circuit design are not covered very well by ANY of the amateur radio theory tests. CW always has been and probably will continue to be the yardstick by which the "competent" radio amateur is measured. That does not seem appropriate given what is happening in commercial RF.

Since most amateurs only "pretend" to have an understanding of RF theory, the CW tests remain as the only filter for keeping out the undesirables.

And you thought amateur radio was high tech!

```
--  
/`- _      kevin.jessup@mixcom.com  
{      }/    Marquette Electronics, Inc  
 \      /    N9SQB, ARRL, Amateur Radio  
 |__*|    N9SQB @ WD9ANY.#MKE.WI.USA.NA
```

Date: 31 Mar 1994 19:40:51 GMT
From: news.mentorg.com!hpbab33.mentorg.com!wv.mentorg.com!hanko@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Incentive Licensing
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <Troyce-290394082614@idmb-secretary.tamu.edu>, Troyce@bio.tamu.edu (Troyce) writes:

```
|> I have a question. I've read many comments over the past several months  
|> about "incentive licensing" and how it has affected amateur radio. I  
|> gather that this was a concept that was introduced in the 60's or 70's.  
|> What I'd like to know, is what IS incentive licensing, and how it was  
|> different from the previous method, and how it's different from what we  
|> have now.
```

We have "always" had incentive licensing, at least since I got my first license some 40 years ago. However, the term has come to mean that "big change" the ARRL sponsored back in the 60s ... where existing priveleges were TAKEN AWAY from several license classes. One was then required to upgrade to retain privileges one previously had. That was the "incentive" ... you know: a big stick, not a carrot.

... Hank

--

Hank Oredson @ Mentor Graphics
Internet : hank_oredson@mentorg.com
Amateur Radio: WORLI@WORLI.OR.USA.NOAM

Date: Thu, 31 Mar 1994 16:16:19 EST
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!eff!
news.kei.com!yeshua.marcam.com!charnel!olivea!news.bu.edu!dartvax.dartmouth.edu!
saturn.caps.maine.edu!@@ihnp4.ucsd.edu
Subject: lowest frequency FCC cares about?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Hi all..

Does anyone know if there is a minimum frequency that the
FCC has jurisdiction over? I have heard that the Navy can
communicate with submerged subs at frequencies around 300 Hz!
(Yes, hertz.) I guess my question really is can I legally
transmit at ultra-low frequencies like this?

thanks,
Rob NV1A
rlm@maine.maine.edu

Date: 31 Mar 1994 21:36:02 -0800
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.cerf.net!ccnet.com!ccnet.com!not-for-
mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: lowest frequency FCC cares about?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Robert L. Metcalf NV1A (RLM@MAINE.MAINE.EDU) wrote:
: Hi all..

: Does anyone know if there is a minimum frequency that the
: FCC has jurisdiction over? I have heard that the Navy can
: communicate with submerged subs at frequencies around 300 Hz!
: (Yes, hertz.) I guess my question really is can I legally
: transmit at ultra-low frequencies like this?

: thanks,

: Rob NV1A
: rlm@maine.maine.edu

If you try this with your ham licence in your back pocket, the boys from Cutler may come by and snatch it. You really don't want to interfere with those sub comms. Our lowert band is 160 meters. Join the Navy and get to operate one of those stations. You should see the antenna farms for this type of communications station. Vary Large Array.

Bob

--

Bob Wilkins	work	bwilkins@cave.org
Berkeley, California	home	rwilkins@ccnet.com
94701-0710	play	n6fri@n6eeg.#nocal.ca.usa.noam

Date: Fri, 1 Apr 1994 13:37:40 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!grian!pelican!ent-img.com!wb6hqm!
bart@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: lowest frequency FCC cares about?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <94090.161619RLM@maine.maine.edu>,
Robert L. Metcalf NV1A <RLM@MAINE.MAINE.EDU> wrote:

>Hi all..

>

>Does anyone know if there is a minimum frequency that the
>FCC has jurisdiction over? I have heard that the Navy can
>communicate with submerged subs at frequencies around 300 Hz!
>(Yes, hertz.) I guess my question really is can I legally
>transmit at ultra-low frequencies like this?

Part 15 kicks in at 9 KHz and i've never heard of any FCC regulations
of any kind dealing with spectrum below. It was changed from 10 KHz
a number of years ago.

As a practical matter it's very difficult (\$\$) to generate any significant
ELF/ULF radiation anyway so from what I can tell we're welcome to try! I'm
quite interested in ground current communication with carriers in the few
Hz range.

bart

bart@wb6hqm.ent-img.com

>
>thanks,
>Rob NV1A
>rlm@maine.maine.edu

Date: 1 Apr 1994 16:16:22 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!
hearst.acc.Virginia.EDU!portal.gmu.edu!fame!smasters@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: lowest frequency FCC cares about?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Robert L. Metcalf NV1A (RLM@MAINE.MAINE.EDU) wrote:
: Hi all..

: Does anyone know if there is a minimum frequency that the
: FCC has jurisdiction over? I have heard that the Navy can
: communicate with submerged subs at frequencies around 300 Hz!

They actually operate at a much lower frequency. The
communications is a FSK modulation. The two frequencies are 46Hz and
72Hz (I may be off by 3 or so Hz). Select which one you want to call
mark and which one you want to call space, and you have a communicatins
system.

As for an individual transmitting down this low. All the
frequencies upto 300 GHz are spoken for. Above that you will tend to
use lasers, which are controlled by a dept of the FDA. For low
frequencies, there is a 1750 meter band that is for public se with
restrictions(1 Watt output, no transmission or antenna longer then 50'
is what comes to mind, but don't quote me, look it up on the QRZ
CD-ROM). If you had the backyard and power to relistically transmit at
these frequencies you can most likly declare your own country and do as
you please:-).

73,
Shawn
KE4GHS

: thanks,
: Rob NV1A
: rlm@maine.maine.edu

--
Shawn C. Masters
smasters@gmu.edu

I speak for myself, not my department or institution.

Date: 2 Apr 94 06:56:34 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!
usenet@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: Ramsey Kits
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Don Bertino <bertino@netcom.com> writes:

>I have a question. Is it legal to broadcast with a FM Ramsey kit. In the
>>manual it says that it is. Is this true?

It is indeed, IF you make very certain to use an open frequency. Before you pick one, do some careful checking with a digitally tuned FM radio fed by a good omnidirectional antenna. Unlicensed operations can't cause interference to ANY licensed station, no matter how far away, so you need to keep your transmitter at least 0.4 MHz away from ANYTHING you can hear clearly in your area. Also, you can't go below 87.9 MHz (88.3 if you have a TV station on channel 6) or above 107.9 MHz, for whatever reason.

The Ramsey FM-10's manual does a good job of explaining this and other issues.

One other thing: If you expect other listeners to hear your broadcasts, you'll need to operate on a frequency with an odd decimal value (88.7, 95.3, 102.5, etc.). Most digitally tuned car radios (unlike many home sets) can't tune anything else.

-- Ed Ellers, KD4AWQ

Date: 2 Apr 94 04:38:45 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.cerf.net!ccnet.com!ccnet.com!not-for-mail@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2n0e8l\$sd@dancer.cc.bellcore.com>, <032894224930Rnf0.77b8@amcomp.com>, <h84MZTd.edellers@delphi.com>
Subject : Re: Coord. priority for open repeaters

Ed Ellers (edellers@delphi.com) wrote:

:
: Which would seem to back up my assertion that a repeater licensee should be
: able to chase lids off without having to turn the repeater into what is
: generally considered a "closed" machine.

Ed we are all curious ... do you use local repeaters in your area? How do your local groups handle the obvious lid situations? If you have never traveled on the Interstate Highways, you may be unaware of the dangers of truckers that speed with overloaded vehicles ... they ignore the law. There are many innocent victims. Those trucks keep on coming, so do the lids. Don't tell us there are cops ... we all know they are never there when you need them.

Bob

--

Bob Wilkins	work	bwilkins@cave.org
Berkeley, California	home	rwilkins@ccnet.com
94701-0710	play	n6fri@n6eeg.#nocal.ca.usa.noam

Date: 31 Mar 1994 19:02:35 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!news.Brown.EDU!NewsWatcher!user@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Mar28.032552.3146@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>,
<Rm4PpbE.edellers@delphi.com>, <[2nek31\\$6sp@dancer.cc.bellcore.com](mailto:2nek31$6sp@dancer.cc.bellcore.com)>
Subject : Re: Coord. priority for open repeaters

In article <[2nek31\\$6sp@dancer.cc.bellcore.com](mailto:2nek31$6sp@dancer.cc.bellcore.com)>,
whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com (sohl,william h) wrote:

> And in both cases, the use of a clear frequency doesn't violate the
> rules. No one has exclusive use of any frequency, so if two hams have
> a QSO on a repeater input or output, I still see no rules violation.
> Remember too, nothing in the rules requires any ham to commit the entire
> repeater directory to memory, nor must any ham necessarily purchase
> or own a repeater directory for reference.

If two hams want to have a conversation on the input or output of a repeater pair can run into alot of problems. For example, lets say N1ABC and his friend, N1I(Don't)CW are on 146.100 babbling on. They're keying the repeater up consistently which is one problem. But now an authorized user gets on. Who takes precedence?

As for your comment about repeater directories.... ever hear of a band plan?

Tony

--

== Anthony_Pelliccio@Brown.edu (Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR)
== Box 1908, Providence, RI 02912 Tel. (401) 863-1880
== All opinions expressed are those of the individual, and not those
== of Brown University.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #159
